

17-3

Christianity and Society

The 1952 Election—

- Pitfalls for Political Protestants
- Republicans, Democrats and Foreign Policy
- Freedom, Power and the State
- A Tribute to Truman
- Dutch Calvinism in South Africa
- What Is ADA?

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

A Quarterly devoted to Christianity and Social Reconstruction

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Editor*

ERNEST LEFEVER

Guest Editor of This Issue

Editorial Board

John C. Bennett	William Miller
William Clemes	Roger Ortmyer
John Dillenberger	Roger Shinn
Eduard Heimann	Clifford Stanley
Ernest Lefever	M. Moran Weston
	Winnifred Wygal

Christian Action Executive Council

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, LISTON POPE, *Chairmen*

Donald L. Benedict	William Miller
John C. Bennett	A. T. Mollegen
David S. Burgess	Walter G. Muelder
Ray Gibbons	Victor Obenhaus
Robert T. Handy	E. E. Schattschneider
F. Ernest Johnson	Walter W. Sikes
Charles D. Kean	Alfred W. Swan
Elizabeth Lam	Kenneth Underwood
Harold C. Letts	M. Moran Weston
Charles S. McCoy	Winnifred Wygal
Alexander Miller	George D. Younger

JOHN W. TURNBULL, *Executive Secretary*

537 West 121st Street
New York 27, New York

CHRISTIAN ACTION

Christianity and Society is published by Christian Action, a fellowship of Christians concerned with the social implications of their faith. Christian Action seeks:

To understand current social issues in the light of central Christian convictions.

To provide a fellowship for mutual support and criticism among Christians who are profoundly concerned about the social problems of our time.

To encourage groups of Christians to act creatively and responsibly in their local communities as well as in national and international affairs.

To develop a core of common convictions and principles for the strengthening of the Christian social witness.

New ways to influence the churches and secular society in the direction of greater responsibility to all members of the community.

Christian Action is a voluntary organization. It is not officially related to the social education and action agencies of the denominations or of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., but it seeks to co-operate with and support them.

Everyone who is committed to these fundamental purposes and interests is invited to join Christian Action. There are members in every part of the country, and in every major denomination.

Christianity and Society is published quarterly by Christian Action. Subscriptions: U. S., \$1.50 per year; 40¢ per copy. England, 6 shillings per year. Australia, 7 shillings and six pence per year. Subscriptions should be sent to Mrs. Nola Meade, Secretary, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y., or to Donald M. Mathers, Annandale, North End Road, London N.W. 11, United Kingdom.



CHRISTIANITY and SOCIETY

EDITORIALS

Our Faith and Concrete Political Decisions

In a Presidential year the air is full of political speculations and opinions. Christians, no less than other citizens, are called upon to make fateful political decisions which may determine the fate of the country and the world. One might well ask whether there is anything in their Christian commitment which will lead them to morally superior decisions. We in Christian Action assume that it is possible to express our faith in terms of our political responsibilities. However, probably none of us is as certain as we once were that the Christian faith can be identified with some neat ideological position or political program. It is significant that in this Presidential year Christians of all shades of belief will probably unite in rejecting nationalist-isolationist candidates and programs, while there will be less agreement on domestic problems. This is why a Taft candidacy will arouse an almost united opposition in the Christian community, while an Eisenhower candidacy will not.

This situation is symptomatic of the very problematic way in which Christian convictions are related to the political order. We should long since have known that there are no clear choices between good and evil in the realm of politics and economics. Our primary quarrel in Christian Action today is with those Christians who identify a pretty unqualified free enterprise doctrine with the Christian faith. We must admit, however, that people with our general shade of conviction once were inclined to

challenge this libertarianism with equally questionable collectivist doctrines, which we regarded as radical alternatives to the morally complacent position. Meanwhile, Russian communism presented modern history with a complete corruption of the collectivist doctrine. This does not prove, as some contemporary conservatives would have it, that all political control of economic processes must end in tyranny. But it does prove that political control has its own perils, which may or may not be greater than the perils of an uncontrolled economy. These alternate perils are due to the fact that in the realm of politics and economics we must harness and provisionally justify the forces of egoism and of power even though they be ultimately hazardous either to freedom or to brotherhood. We cannot disavow the use of power because it is hazardous, but neither must we obscure the moral peril of power. This is the reason why no political program can be simply equated with the highest sanctities of life, and why our political decisions must be more circumspect than Christian decisions in America have been either on the right or on the left. Nothing is clearer than that ideologically consistent political positions have on the whole been refuted by history, while healthy nations have preserved freedom and extended justice by various pragmatic policies which borrowed from various strategies.

This does not mean that we must not and cannot make clear-cut decisions on matters

of principle. It is becoming apparent, for instance, that the question of National Health Insurance (usually referred to by its opponents as "Socialized medicine") will become an increasingly important political issue. In deciding for or against it we decide for or against certain broad political strategies. But we ought not to decide for or against it on the basis that the policy is abstractly in violation of "freedom", or that abstractly it enhances state control. We ought to make our decision by asking such questions as these: Can a system of economic freedom in medicine guarantee minimal standards of health? Can a socialized scheme be subjected to professional rather than political standards? Is there protection in the scheme against inordinate and disproportionate demands upon it? If the presuppositions of such questions are analyzed it will be apparent that they are rooted in a Christian interpretation of the human situation, for on the one hand they recognize the law of love as our norm; they assume our responsibility for our neighbor's welfare. On the other hand, they recognize the persistence of self-love, including the indeterminate character of human desires, as a perennial factor in any human situation. A Christian faith which recognizes both of these factors will be prevented from aggravating the ideological conflict in modern society. It may even prevent political acrimony in a Presidential year.

Reinhold Niebuhr

A Tribute to Truman

It has become the custom to belittle Harry Truman. This has been true of Protestants in large measure because of the strong Republican preference among them but it has been accentuated among them in recent months by the foolish appointment of General Clark to the Vatican and by the evidences of corruption in the Federal government. While people were telling themselves what a small man Harry Truman is, he was piling up a remarkable record of achievement. How he will stand in history will depend upon the final results

of some of his policies but, if, in the next period, Soviet Communist aggression is stopped and if there is no general shooting war much of the credit will go to decisions made by President Truman.

The President's limitations are so well known that they do not need emphasis here. He has been too complacent about corruption in his government though he can be pardoned for seeing much hypocrisy in the Republican moral zeal at this point, as well as in the failure of many of his critics to see that business interests have usually done the corrupting. He is right, also, in insisting that it is utterly unfair to assume that government as a whole is corrupt. Some of his appointments have been notoriously bad—Ambassador O'Dwyer, for instance. His appointments to the Supreme Court have been rightly held against him. But Truman also appointed men of such calibre as Acheson, Lovett, Harriman, Hoffman and Bowles. Truman has been responsible for such fantastic muddles as the Morris-McGrath episode. Perhaps Truman's greatest weakness has been his inability to dramatize issues and to lift the sights of the public through his own leadership.

As one looks back over the record the astonishing thing is how often this man—counted so little—has been right on the most fateful issues. He has shown courage and, often, downright stubbornness in adhering to his decisions on these issues.

On foreign policy he has always seen clearly the need of a balance between military preparations and constructive policies that are designed to build up the social and economic health of non-Communist countries. The following policies were made possible by Truman's vision even though they may have been conceived by other minds of his choosing: consistent support of the U. N., the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan and E. C. A., Point 4 and the Bowles mission, the Berlin air-lift, the Korean action and the limits placed upon it symbolized by the recall of McArthur, the Atlantic Pact, the Japanese occupation policies and the peace treaty.

On domestic policies Truman has a good record of intentions and of stubborn courage but less has been accomplished. He did extract from Congress the extension of social security but most of his record has been one of struggle in behalf of civil rights for Negroes, in behalf of civil liberties for the people as a whole against the McCarthys and the McCarrans, and in behalf of strong anti-inflation measures. He is now given credit for administrative reforms in the federal government. He has carried on the New Deal tradition of support for those segments of the economy, especially labor and agriculture, which had had least power to help themselves in previous periods.

It is a safe prediction that this record of achievement and of stubborn intention will be remembered long after the things that have caused men to think of Truman as a small man have been forgotten.

John C. Bennett

'The Deadly Imposition of Conformity'

In the May issue of *Harper's* is a fascinating account of an art teacher whose dismissal from Fairmont State College, West Virginia, took place under all too familiar circumstances.

Dr. Luella Raab Mundel came to the college in 1949 as chairman of the department of art, bringing with her a Ph.D. from Iowa State University and a sheaf of teaching references and credentials from other institutions.

The beginning of her undoing came a year later, when she reluctantly agreed to participate in an American Legion sponsored "Americanism seminar." The frail, slightly neurotic teacher stirred up a tempest when she demanded proof of Owen Lattimore's Communist affiliation and expressed unabashed resentment of charges that college faculties were heavily infiltrated by Reds.

Her ouster, despite the courageous stand of the college prexy, who later was forced to resign, was swiftly engineered. A certain

Mrs. Loudin, equally impressive both as a pillar of the First Methodist Church, where she played the organ, and the Board of Education, where she had a fine reputation for "taking care of any characters who might step out of line," as one local citizen expressed it, took care of the details.

Mrs. Loudin demanded the art teacher's resignation on the grounds she was a "poor security risk." This charge being found baseless—the FBI had no record on the teacher—Mrs. Loudin decided the woman was "just incompetent." But her faculty colleagues rated her an excellent teacher, and her 10 art majors liked her just fine. Finally, Mrs. Loudin said she just could not bear to vote for a budget which carried a salary item "for an atheist." Dr. Mundel was fired.

The story of the subsequent trial got little attention from the press. The AP relied on a stringer, and the local papers, heavily weighted in favor of Mrs. Loudin, fumed "because the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, and the New York press were not here."

Actually the papers do carry quite a number of items which reflect a variation on this theme, although they are generally buried in the back pages. One day we read of a dean of men at Hunter College being demoted to a teaching post for being "too active" politically; a television station cancelling a Charlie Chaplin movie because the local veterans commander regards the star as pro-communist; of an outstanding chemist being denied a passport because someone suspects he might be a Communist, despite his name being blacklisted by Soviet chemical circles; of a Bulgarian refugee detained 14 months by U. S. immigration officials without a hearing; of a Brooklyn clergyman being turned down, without being told the reasons, on a passport application for travel to Japan.

These incidents are alarming enough as clear violations of free speech; but what makes the situation dangerous is the fact that more and more we are coming to accept these things as a natural course of events. We are imperiled by what Presi-

dent Truman has called "the deadly imposition of conformity."

This sickness in our American society can be traced in a large measure to what we have come to talk about as the cold war with Russia. This enables Joe McCarthy cheerfully to assassinate character and ruin innocent people, with the reckless abandon of a man on a merry-go-round.

It has made of Whittaker Chambers through his best seller, *Witness*, a pundit of unprecedented stature, and of many ex-communists, persons whose views must be weighed with the utmost seriousness.

In the case of Chambers, we have projected a doctrine—for he is not content to abide by a simple recital of facts regarding the Communist party—which contains not only seeds of gross intolerance, but lays the foundation for an authoritarian system as pernicious as Communism itself.

Chambers contends, and his views are coming to be shared by growing numbers, that the crises in the world can be translated into a struggle between the Party of God and the Party of Man. He tells us that all political divisions among men can be ultimately reduced to two basic theological positions—the vision of a world with God and the vision of a world without Him.

In this neat world of black and white Chambers lumps together New Dealers, humanists, and liberals—presumably they are not members of the Party of God—with the Communists, and the whole kit and kaboodle are party to a vast conspiracy to overthrow our way of life. This kind of doctrine helps to produce the moral climate in which our character assassins and super-patrioteers flourish and perform their demonic work.

As we approach the November elections, which promise to reach a new high in low flying missiles—it might be well to recall the words of John Milton, who upon learning of Parliament's law to censor all books said:

"Who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who

National Conference to Highlight Politics

September 12–13, 1952

The second annual national conference of Christian Action will be held on September 12–13, 1952, at Virginia Episcopal Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia (near Washington). The conference will focus on the responsibility of Christian Action and of American Protestantism toward the major political decisions confronting our nation. There will also be intensive discussion of the organization of Christian Action and the ways of working in local groups. Dean Liston Pope and Prof. John C. Bennett will be among the major speakers. Others will be announced later.

The Alexandria conference will be an important landmark for Christian Action; a time for taking stock at the end of our first year and for setting our sights on future goals and strategies. All Christian Action members are urged to set aside the dates and to plan to attend. Detailed information later about the program, travel pool plans, etc., will be sent to members before long. Others who would like to receive literature about the conference should write:

Christian Action, 537 West 121st
Street, New York 27, N. Y.

destroys a good book, kills reason itself, kills the image of God, as it were . . . We should be wary, therefore, what persecution we raise against the living labors of public men, how we spill that seasoned life of man, preserved and stored up in books; since we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed."

William Clemes

Dutch Calvinism in South Africa

The South African situation marches toward what seems now an inevitable catastrophic climax. The Malan Government exhibits the characteristics of a dictatorship as it tries more and more to maintain the supremacy of the whites on a dark continent. There are many lessons to be learned in this tragic situation. The most obvious one is that the Christian faith can be used as an instrument of evil. While we were fighting Nazism and Communism we were inclined to assume that the evil in them came purely from the denial of the truth of the Christian faith; but here we have an arrogant racist movement which operates under and by the sanction of the Christian faith. This is in a sense the final mystery of evil. We should not be altogether surprised by it for there have been many similar manifestations of Christian corruption in history. As a matter of fact the racism in our own country has, as we know, used Christian symbols to justify itself. It is interesting to note that both the Dutch Calvinism of South Africa and our own fundamentalism in a part of the South, uses a meticulous Christian legalism to obscure the fact that the self is involved in a violation in the law of love. Thus we obey a lot of little laws in order to ease the uneasy conscience which is violating the one law of life.

The South African situation is interesting for another reason because it is a part of the evidence that problems of racial justice are becoming more paramount than the problems of economic justice which once engaged the Christian conscience. We even recognize today that the main sins of the old imperialism were consistent not so much in economic exploitation as in ethnic arrogance. Sometimes imperial rule aroused the resentment of subject populations even when it was economically beneficial. The resentment was caused by the arrogance and contempt of the imperial rulers. The real fact is that racial pride is one form of man's collective egotism, and this collective egotism expresses itself much more in arrogance

and desire for power than it does in terms of greed. Both liberalism and Marxism were wrong in assuming that greed was the primary or the only form of egotism. While we in America do not have as desperate a situation as South Africa, it is nevertheless apparent that our standards of justice are more defective in the realm of race relations than in the realm of economic relations. This has greatly affected the formulations of our task in such a group as our Christian Action. It is bound to color all Christian social movements which seek to bring the whole of social reality under the dominion of Christ.

Reinhold Niebuhr

How Did Your Congressman Vote in 1951 and 1952?

Marking an x on a ballot or pulling a voting lever is an act of faith—an expression of the direction we would like to see our nation take in these days of its increasing world responsibility.

On November 4 approximately 50,000,000 Americans will choose a new President and elect 32 Senators and 435 Congressmen. There is always a tendency to emphasize the Presidential race to the neglect of the Congressional contest. We have learned only too well that such neglect can result in unhappy relations between a President and his Congress. A bad Congress can stalemate a good President.

Responsible voters should study thoroughly the voting records of incumbents seeking reelection. Readers of *Christianity and Society* will find helpful in this connection a box score on the 82nd Congress published by eight Protestant social education groups. The score card tells how each Senator voted on 16 major issues such as public housing, economic controls, tide-lands oil, aid to India, and Mutual Security legislation. The box score covers the 82nd Congress up to April 30, 1952. Copies of *How Did Your Senators and Congressman Vote in 1951 and 1952?* can be had for 10 cents each from the Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

Pitfalls for Political Protestants

David S. Burgess

Few American Protestants possess the gift of political wisdom. They have the innocence of doves, but the knowledge of Serpents is often lacking. The basic cause of their political naivete can be found in the myths of American thinking, which have their roots in distortions and perversions of the basic Protestant faith.

As a churchman who has been active in political campaigns of the South and Middle-West, I have come most reluctantly to six conclusions about the motivating convictions of my Protestant brethren. These I list, realizing full well that there are striking exceptions to every general rule, and that in finding fault with my fellow believers I am but criticizing the prevailing political mentality of America.

Democracy As A Harmony of Interests

1. *The average Protestant believes that democracy is an automatic harmony of political interests rather than a precarious and ever changing balance of these competing interests.* Unconsciously perhaps, he has accepted the basic tenet of Adam Smith that the competition of selfish groups and individuals is conducted within a structure of natural harmony to the benefit of man and the glory of God. To this conviction he adds the N.A.M. twist that freedom of religion, freedom of enterprise and freedom of the ballot box are synonymous in a world where "what's good for business is good for you." These are the economic foundations of his political philosophy, which make him easy prey for the blandishments of every passing politician who says, "I'm going to Washington to represent *all of the people*. I wear no man's halter. I represent no special interest. I just want to be fair to everyone."

Unfortunately, political facts in a democracy refute the legislator's claim that he can be impartial and fair to all, for not even

the most conscientious Congressman or Senator can adequately represent all of his constituents. On every single public issue, he must vote for one group and against another group. If he votes for rent control, he cuts down the landlord's profit but helps the laborer to stretch his dollars. If he favors public housing, he enrages the real estate lobby but gladdens the heart of most working people.

Every thoughtful legislator, moreover, must answer two more puzzling questions. Do I represent only the people who voted for me? Or more narrowly, do I represent only the people who payed the bulk of my campaign expenses? Congressman Eugene Cox of Georgia, for instance, makes no pretense of representing the disfranchised Negroes in his district, nor does his voting record indicate any over concern for the wishes of the poor whites who never cast a ballot. Like many of his colleagues from the South, he is inclined to heed the wishes of the textile magnate, the power executive and the railroad chief who have helped him to build up the required campaign check in past elections. Such funds, in the words of a Cracker politico, seldom come from teachers or preachers or do-gooders. They come instead from the corporation interests who want their representative in Congress "to stay bought."

Under such circumstances, any Congressman like Cox is neither willing nor able to represent "all of the people." Similarly, a Congressman or Senator who is elected by the contributions and votes of working people, can hardly be expected to be at the beck and call of the Chamber of Commerce or the American Medical Association. He will aid business when it is feasible, but in a division of the house on an important question, he will choose the side of labor.

Now and then there appears in the halls of Congress a man who can understand the interdependence of labor and capital,

farmer and worker, America and other lands. He may not be the servant of any special pressure group. Yet on every roll-call vote, he must support one group against another group; he must oppose or defend his party and the ruling administration. He must decide what is practical, how he can be re-elected, what group he can support or oppose—while he is walking the tightrope of his own conscience. And he will be the first to inform any doubting Protestant that natural harmonies of interest in politics are few and far between.

Personality vs. Voting Record

2. *The average Protestant judges a candidate on his personality rather than upon his voting record.* Since each Senator or Congressman outside of the "one-party" South must depend upon temporary coalitions of certain interests to be re-elected, he attempts to be "all things to all men." Before the local Grange, he claims familiarity with hay and manure. Before the Rotary, he pontificates on the intricacies of meeting a payroll. Before the local trade unions, he displays a union card and exhibits hard calluses on his hands—the result, he claims, of working as a doffer in a local textile mill a few years back. Added to this sudden knowledge of farm and business and factory is the legislator's ability to spin a yarn, shake a hand, kiss a babe, remember a first name, pose with rod and reel in hand—and generally appear as an all-around regular Joe. These are the familiar ruses by which a candidate covers up his objectionable voting record or the questionable sources of his financial support. And most Protestants, impressed by certain personal virtues, are the victims of his wiles.

The politician spreads the web of his influence further by the knowledge that most voters are more interested in personal favors than in vital public issues. Examples on this phenomenon can be found in every state. The white supremacy administration of a Carolina town, for instance, was able to keep the Negro vote "in line" by the promise of a paved road. The Legionnaires of a southern city gave a certain

Congressman their wholehearted support because, by his special dispensation, one member of the post was given a round-trip flight to Japan to visit his wounded son. Residents of a certain Atlanta suburb voted solidly for a legislator who was allegedly responsible for the construction of a new post office.

By receiving such favors, Protestants are laying the groundwork for machine control in politics. Memphis—a well-churched Protestant city—is the prime example of this condition. Upon arrival in the city, every newcomer is visited by a block worker from the Crump headquarters. The visitor tells the new resident about the neighborhood schools, the means of garbage disposal, police tickets, local statutes, and generally offers a helping hand. The party worker then returns on the eve of the next election to remind the newcomer of the favors rendered him and the vote expected of him. Usually, the newcomer, believing that one good turn deserves another, takes the suggestion willingly not fully realizing that his action is merely strengthening boss rule in Memphis.

Corruption in Politics

3. *The average Protestant believes that corruption in government is caused by crooked politicians too long in power rather than by the extension of conventional business ethics into the government itself.* To us Protestants, reform is a magic word. "Clean out the Court House", "Throw Out the Rats", "Fumigate Washington"—these slogans of this election year fall as sweet music upon our ears.

Reforms are desperately needed. Crooks must be deposed from public office. Changes must be made. To this we can all agree. But like Lincoln Steffens who had more faith in bosses who served the common people than in business interests who milked the people under the guise of reform, let us examine each reform movement carefully on its own individual merits. Who finances it? What real changes are proposed? What interests will be served if

the movement is victorious at the polls? These questions must be answered.

During the last two years, leading churchmen of Protestantism have made bold statements against mink coats, deep freezers, free Florida hotel suites, and similar symbols of petty corruption in Washington. But generally, these prophets have confined their attacks to the *results* of corruption in government rather than to the *causes* of these evils in public life. The fact is that the national government is now conducting the biggest business operation in the world. Its defense contracts are the most lucrative, and corporation competes against corporation to obtain them. Yet, as *Fortune* (February, 1952) recently informed the American public:

Shocking numbers of American businessmen are quite prepared to bribe their way through Washington. Shocking numbers persist in believing, even when advised to the contrary, that decisions in their favor can be obtained only by purchase and exercise of improper influence.

The major source of corruption in the federal government are the corporate interests of America, who, under the protection of special legislation and with the help of their kept representatives, are able to steal millions from the public treasuries within the bounds of the law. The Tidelands Oil Bill, the Kerr Gas Bill, the amortization provisions of the Defense Production Act, the scandalous "depletion" allowances for gas and oil companies, the capital-gains and split-income loopholes of the present tax bill, the outrageous subsidies to newspapers and airlines at taxpayers expense—all are bold examples of corruption of government within the confines of legality.

\$4,612,000 For Taft in 1950

Having performed their "good turn" for the interests, many a legislator is paid-off either by direct gifts or by pledges for future campaigns. Only recently have the names of Cox, Boykin, Bridges, Brewster

Civil Service: 1881-1952

We have made great progress since 1881 . . . Then there was virtually no civil service. By the turn of the century 50 per cent of Federal employees were under civil service.

And now, over 93 per cent of all Federal employees in the United States are under the competitive Civil Service. This is the highest percentage in the history of our Government. That is a remarkable achievement, but it is by no means the whole story. In addition to our regular Civil Service, special merit systems have been set up for various agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. When these are taken into account, the number of employees covered by the merit system comes to 99 per cent of the total.

President Harry S. Truman
May 2, 1952

and McCarthy appeared in connection with certain alleged pay-offs. The necessity for high campaign costs makes both Congressmen and Senators easy prey for the special interests. This is a growing problem about which church leaders have shown slight concern. Back in 1923, for instance, Senator Truman Newberry of Michigan was forced to resign from the Senate when it was discovered that he had spent \$195,000 to get elected. In similar fashion Senator William S. Vare of Pennsylvania was denied a Senate seat as a result of his \$785,000 expenditure in 1928. But few Protestants in or out of Congress raised their eyebrows disapprovingly when in his 1950 campaign for re-election to the U. S. Senate, Robert Taft of Ohio spent \$1,222 of his own money and \$612,000 of his friends' money. In addition, more than \$4,000,000 was spent in his behalf. After revealing these facts in a Boston speech, Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois advised the American people to favor "the honest candidate, not the one

with the most money." (*Boston Globe*, January 13, 1952)

Moral reform is needed in government. But Protestants cannot become genuine reformers nor effective prophets until they have discovered the basic sources of corruption in public life—both within the law and outside the law.

Misunderstanding the Power Structure

4. *The average Protestant believes that the existing power structure is the will of God rather than the result of men's fears and insecurities.* Though few Protestants accept literally the Lutheran doctrine that "the powers that be are ordained by God," they tend unconsciously to subscribe to the doctrine's secular counterpart. To them, the small-town banker, who knows and controls the credit of most local citizens, has gained his power by virtue of his own labors. The lawyer, the merchant and even the mayor are likewise rewarded for their good words, and conversely the citizens living on the other side of the tracks have been justly rewarded for their own unworthiness.

Senator Robert Taft and Senator Richard Nixon recently affirmed their faith in this Horatio Alger myth and their trust in the wisdom of the corporate powers—that be when they submitted a strongly worded minority report claiming that the Taft-Hartley Law had *not* prevented textile workers from organizing in the South. Castigating the majority findings most vigorously, the Senators declared:

Because [certain] textile workers sometimes by themselves and at other times joined by the minister, the doctor, the drug-store merchant and the proprietor of the local 5 and 10 store have taken steps to defeat the organizational efforts of the CIO, the [majority] staff report assumes without argument that their efforts must have been directed by the employer. . . . Neither the subcommittee nor the [National Labor Relations] Board were able to find any evidence whatsoever of employer spon-

sorship of anti-union activity. . . . In the American Thread case, the majority professes to believe a story of the kidnapping of a union organizer, notwithstanding that a grand jury investigated the charges and found insufficient grounds for an indictment.*

In making such claims, the Ohio and California Senators display a shocking ignorance of the basic facts of life in a feudal mill town. Often ministers are controlled. Politicians are bought. Juries are fixed. And workers under the "job-lash" of the employer are hired and fired at his bidding. The Senators' blindness may not have been willful. Possibly, they just wanted to reaffirm their faith in the virtue of all employers and in the glories of the free-enterprise system.

But reality is something different. For the political structure of American life, in a more diluted and complex form, closely parallels that of a southern mill town. In Virginia, for instance, many a promising attorney faces the possibility of losing his major clients if he dares to run against a Byrd-Machine candidate. In the 1950 Senatorial race in Ohio, many Protestant ministers and even politicians hesitated to identify themselves too closely with Mr. Taft's opposition for fear of alienating the Protestant majority in the state—and in 1952 with Catholic Mike De Salle running against Protestant Joe Bricker the same pattern of fear will again prevail.

Until a churchman analyzes the power structure of any state or city, until he knows the power of fear and hatred to shape political decisions, he will never understand the elemental fact of politics that the ruling interests of America will adopt any means to perpetuate themselves in power. In California, they will shout "communism" at their opponents. In South Carolina, they will yell "nigger-lover" at all liberals. In New England, they will preach against the "foreign element." In Texas, they will prate about "states rights". Now

* See: Minority Report, Labor-Management Report for Southern Textile Industry. 82nd Congress, 1952. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pages 71-74.

and then their arguments will be gar-
nished by a pinch of sincerity, but in the
main their propagandizing is for one pur-
pose alone—to confuse the voter sufficiently
so as to gain or hold power.

Coercion of Law vs. Persuasion

5. *The average Protestant believes that a law with penalty provisions is less desirable than voluntary agreement to a code.* This strong preference for voluntarism is deep in our traditions of freedom. It stems from our belief in love, in persuasion, in winning of human hearts to the cause of justice. And our beliefs are reflected in the popular adage, "If all men would accept Christ, laws wouldn't be necessary."

Our dilemma as true Protestants begins when one man's freedom to discriminate deprives another man of his rights under the law. This basic ethical problem has been made clear in recent debates about a compulsory F.E.P.C. law. Its chief opponent is Senator Richard Russell of Georgia who has made a great appeal to American business by declaring that freedom to discriminate is part and parcel of the American free-enterprise system. "Compulsory F.E.P.C. is socialism," he argued last February on *Meet the Press*, "and I am American enough to believe that, if a drug store owner wants to serve only red-headed people with brown eyes, he can do it."

Though many northern Republicans of Protestant persuasion would not put their argument quite so brazenly, they would agree with Russell's contention that the Federal Government should not force the employer to be fair in his employment practices. This same abhorrence of government intervention dominated the minds of most Republicans of Protestant heritage when, year after year, they opposed minimum wage laws, child-labor statutes, social security measures and similar acts which are now accepted as elemental justice. These Republicans wanted the employer to be fair and just to his workers—but they did not want to force him to be virtuous.

The force of law is sometimes necessary. A wealthy textile manufacturer once admitted to me. "The federal government was the greatest Christianizer of the South in the 'thirties and 'forties," he confessed. "If the Government hadn't forced me to pay good wages, overtime and what not, I never would have done it myself."

In the light of this frank confession, we must consider the present need for an F.E.P.C. law, especially for the Negro in the South. He cannot raise his standard of living or properly educate his children because he is denied good employment opportunities. With the exception of a few first-class jobs within the Negro community itself, he is barred from professional positions, from clerical opportunities, and from good factory jobs. Until recently, the fate of the Negro outside the South has been similar. But in the space of the last seven years, 11 states and 22 municipalities, with a combined population of approximately 60 million, have enacted statutes prohibiting discrimination in employment practices. When thoughtful Protestants begin to study the beneficial effects of these laws, they will understand why laws with penalty provisions do not sound the death-knell for freedom. Instead, as has been so clearly demonstrated in the case of state and local F.E.P.C. laws, the removal of discriminations by law brings a greater freedom to more and more Americans. Protestants, of course, must also guard against inadvisable encroachments of federal power upon the historical freedom of individuals and groups, but at the same time they must not make compulsion the negative yardstick to measure every piece of legislation.

Protestant Anglo-Saxon Bias

6. *The average Protestant believes that every new and emerging power group in American political life should be resisted rather than accepted as a needed addition to the public life of our nation.* Because we were the first newcomers to these shores, we Protestants of Anglo-Saxon lineage have resisted the Irish, the Italians, the Chinese

and Japanese, and other immigrants who have attempted to gain their rightful place beside us in American political life. We have often made them our employees and servants. In the South, where immigrants and foreigners were few, we hired the poor white, and to cap the bargain we imported Negroes from Africa to be our slaves. We Anglo-Saxon Protestants fought the Jeffersonians, the Workingman's Party, the Jacksonians, the Knights of Labor, the Haymarket Rioters, the Socialists, the AFL and now the CIO. All of these we have called our enemies. By our scornings and our exploitation, we have now driven these scattered minority groups into what America now calls—for want of a better name—the Democratic Party. And today a majority of us who profess the Protestant faith and who live outside of the South are members and supporters of the opposing Republican Party.

The average Protestant like ourselves defends his privileged position in American society by comparing his genteel manners with the grossness of the opposition. He forgets, as we so often forget, that any group of working people—whether they be Negroes in Chicago, Japanese in California, French-Canadians in Maine or stevedores in New York—who are clamoring for recognition and struggling against the ruling powers cannot be expected to follow the accepted code of etiquette laid down by "the better people". They will strike—and bloodshed may result. They may march—and the police will throw tear-gas. They may pack the precinct meeting—and noisily vote out the old guard. They may push us in the bus and therefore get back for centuries of white man's abuse. They may brag and swagger and boast as they have a foretaste of their future power—but this is only the pattern of change within the structure of our existing democracy. And so instead of keeping these rebelling groups in their designated place of subservience, we Anglo-Saxon Protestants, whose forefathers planted the seed of liberty on our shores, should welcome our new neighbors into the family of America whose members are expected to be both just and responsible.

If these are the mental and spiritual pitfalls of the average run-of-the-pew Protestant, what can the church do in 1952?

What the Church Can Do

First, the church must help its members to stay within the political arena. A holiness preacher once said that all Christians should stay out of unions and politics since St. Paul had warned the faithful "not to be unequally yoked with unbelievers." After questioning he admitted that his doctrine of withdrawal stemmed from his fear that all persons, irrespective of the power of their own personal faith, would be automatically corrupted by mere association with any secular organization. His caution reflected a similar hesitancy to enter public life on the part of many idealistic churchmen. By remaining pure and unsullied by the world, they turn over to the professional politician the whole domain of American public life. Against this tendency to escape from our God-given responsibilities, the churches must wage a ceaseless battle.

Second, the churches must explain the intimate connection between political decisions and human welfare. No minister or group of laymen can perform this task without discussing "controversial questions" which, without the power of Christian grace, will tend to divide many local congregations. But the effort must be made, with full knowledge of the fact that the morality of any single political position is always debatable and highly dependent upon related decisions of public policy. Labor legislation, public housing, price control, states rights, corruption and foreign aid—on none of these questions is there a clear-cut, Christian answer. Yet on every issue every professing believer, in the light of God's will, must find his answer, since every political decision has an important effect upon the freedom, the fears, the income, the happiness and responsibility of men and women throughout the world.

Third, the churches must help its members to differentiate between the genuine

Continued on page 30

Democrats, Republicans and A Responsible Foreign Policy

Herman F. Reissig

A responsible American foreign policy must have three central aims: to prevent the expansion of Russian-led communism, to avoid a general war, and to develop a community of nations free from totalitarian control and committed to the practice of mutual aid. The first two of these aims are of equal importance and to achieve both of them requires an almost super-human combination of firmness, sagacity, and self-control. But they are essentially negative. Success in halting the spread of Stalinist communism and in preventing universal atomic war does not, by itself, constitute an adequate goal. Beyond the prevention of the threatening evils lies the real goal: a world community in which the nations accept the fact of their interdependence and their responsibility to the whole community and work together to build the political, economic and cultural institutions which will express and advance their essential unity of interests.

No political party is fit to be trusted with the reins of American government unless it puts adequate emphasis on each of these aims. Let us examine each aim in more detail. Contemporary communism expands in two main ways: by its ability to convince strategic groups in a nation that it has the only effective solution for the problems of poverty and political weakness, and by the use of military power. This means that the prevention of communist expansion requires a two-fold program—one for dealing with social situations which are in fact insupportable, and the other with the threat of Soviet military aggression. This means that there must be collective military power of sufficient strength to deter outright aggression, plus agreement on the part of the free nations that their collective military strength will be used if aggression does occur.

There is little difference of opinion between the two main political parties on the necessity of providing armed power sufficient to impress the Kremlin with the danger of launching further aggression and adequate to give us a chance of winning if war should come. There is a significant difference between the present Democratic administration and powerful elements in the Republican Party on: 1) the relation of specific action against aggression to the risking of all-out war and 2) the relation of U. S. military policies to collective security.

Taft-MacArthur Republicans must not be accused of wanting all-out war. It would seem, however, that their willingness to use measures which certainly would add greatly to the risk of global war indicates that the prevention of war as an aim of U. S. policy is subordinated to the prevention of communist expansion. A responsible foreign policy sees clearly that a general war would not, in itself, be a defense of freedom. It might, indeed, be as effective in destroying freedom as the extension of communist tyranny.

The Dulles Proposal

John Foster Dulles proposes, as a major change in foreign policy, that the United States issue what sounds like an ultimatum. We should declare, he says, that any further aggression will be met by direct attacks on communist "vital centers," that is, on Russian or Chinese cities, or both. It should be said that whether or not Mr. Dulles is actually suggesting anything that can be described as an "ultimatum" is not clear. Walter Lippman says (New York *Herald Tribune*, June 10, 1952) he has offered "a series of calculated ambiguities." It is, of course, important that the potential aggres-

son should know that military aggression cannot be committed without danger to the aggressor and his companions in arms. It is of equal importance to avoid over-all and rigid commitment to retaliation which might turn any future episode into universal atomic war. Risk cannot be avoided, but policies designed to lessen the likelihood of aggression should not be such as to increase the probability that local military action will lead to general war. When General Eisenhower was asked in a press conference what he thought of Mr. Dulles' proposal, he began by paying warm tribute to Mr. Dulles' writings on the subject of East-West relations, but ended by expressing some doubt as to the wisdom of putting chips on our shoulder and daring our opponents to knock them off. It is a fair inference that Eisenhower is in substantial agreement with the wise, if precarious and difficult, balance the administration has tried to keep between firmness against aggression and the avoidance of actions and policies that would almost certainly, and unnecessarily, increase the risk of general war.

Whether the greater belligerence or impatience of the Taft-MacArthur wing of the Republican Party, as compared with the Democratic administration, derives from more firmness against the communists and a less lively appreciation of the disaster of war, or whether it is more the result of partisan rejection of whatever the administration does, it is impossible to say. In any case, the voter who sees that communist expansion *and* global war are evils of equal depth will look with some skepticism at a party in which the Taft-MacArthur views on this matter have so much influence. Without committing the folly of asserting that the combination of firmness, sagacity and self-control is confined to the Democratic Party, it would seem fair to say that the majority of conspicuous advocates of a simple "get tough" policy are in the Republican Party.

Since this is being written before the parties have adopted their 1952 platforms and named their standard bearers, it may

be well to interpolate here the observation that not everything depends on the platform and the Presidential nominee. If the Democrats elect a President and control the Congress we can be fairly certain that, in the main, present foreign policies will be continued. If the Republicans win it is difficult to predict. In office, for example, Taft might well come closer to present policies than his speeches as candidate indicate. He might also make critically important changes. Eisenhower would not, so far as one can know at this writing, make substantial changes. But President Eisenhower would have to reckon with Senator Taft and Senator McCarthy and the powerful elements they represent. His inexperience in politics, in some ways a virtue, might make it extremely difficult for him to control the advocates of an unwise foreign policy in his own party.

Mutual Security vs. Unilateral Defense

In the question of collective security as over against unilateral military policies there is a clear difference between the present administration and important elements in the G.O.P. Any Republican president will have to deal with influential leaders in his party who advocate that U. S. should "go it alone" or that at least we should have patience with the fears and interests of the other non-communist nations. Nationalism, unilateralism, and moral isolationism, and the emotions which support them are heavily represented in Republican leadership and only peripherally in the Democratic Party. No proposal is more specifically and justifiably associated with General MacArthur than the proposal to "go it alone."

Mr. Taft has given vigorous expression to his lack of faith in collective action through the United Nations. Further, the Senator from Ohio has poured scorn on the contention that the United States cannot defend itself without the help of Western Europe, in such fashion as to suggest that to him the survival of our European friends is of casual importance. It would be

grossly inaccurate to say that all Republicans take a dim view of both collective security and the United Nations. It is nevertheless true that, in the event of a Republican victory at the polls, those who are weakly attached to multilateral decision-making and action would have greater influence than they now have.

Writing for this journal it is not necessary to argue that the United States needs a stronger, not a weaker, commitment to international partnership, especially with the nations between us and the Iron Curtain. Neither is it necessary to show that, without the restraining influences of the other free countries, this nation, so pre-eminently powerful and with so little direct experience of war, might become a danger to itself and to the peace of the world. To avoid pitfalls of the cold war, no less than for our survival under military attack, we need the other nations. If even under the present administration, on the whole genuinely attached to international consultation and collective security, the rest of the non-communist world is sometimes alarmed by our self-confidence and our tendency toward unilateralism, one wonders how they would react to a United States led by a party in which "the new isolationism" has powerful spokesmen.

Responsibility to Underdeveloped Areas

Turn now to the positive goal of a responsible foreign policy—the development of a true community of nations, free from totalitarian control and committed to mutual aid. Here a Christian would wish to speak with some assurance and vigor. There is no necessary contradiction between the Christian view of humanity as one family under God and the development of the modern nation-state. Nor is there any point in moral denunciations of the disparity in the economic development of nations and areas. But in the contemporary world it is impossible to reconcile the Christian ethic with an essentially nationalistic outlook or with its corollary, a complacent acceptance of great wealth in a few

nations and terrible poverty in the rest. It was not wrong for the United States in Washington's day to try to stay clear of Europe because the welfare of neither this country or of the world would have been served by close American involvement in European affairs. In the present world situation it is neither economically feasible nor morally permissible to insist on the degree of independent national action which was possible and desirable in earlier periods. Nor is it morally permissible for a rich country such as ours to be impatient with heavy drafts upon its attention and resources. If isolationism, nationalism, and unilateralism could once be defended on both practical and moral grounds, they now spell moral irresponsibility. With the tools put in our hands by technological advances, the parable of Dives and Lazarus becomes relevant to the relationship of the United States to its poor neighbors. The objection that "we cannot feed the world," or that "our resources are not limitless," or that "we cannot go on increasing taxes and piling up the national debt" must be answered by saying that, whatever may have been true in the past we cannot today defend fantastic luxury in the presence of desperate want. No people that spends as much as we for liquor, cosmetics, fancy automobiles and super-luxury homes can complain that the burden is too heavy without convicting itself of moral sophistry, to say nothing of the wondering incredulity such a nation evokes in the minds of despairing refugees and the hungry millions. The kind of thinking about our world which made it seem reasonable to set national limits to our responsibility has become indefensible. The means and methods of discharging our responsibility to other peoples may be the subject of dispute. The fact of the responsibility must be accepted.

This is the real dividing line between political leaders. The line does not, by any means, divide all Republicans from all Democrats. The question the Christian voter must answer is, "Which of the two parties, on the basis of its over-all record and judged by the attitude of its chief

America's New Responsibility

Decisions we as a people make affect profoundly for good or for ill, not only persons within our borders, but untold millions of God's children throughout the world. Actions of our Congress and policies of our State Department may mean life or death, freedom or tyranny for people in distant lands. Each one of us, in whose name our government acts, has a personal moral responsibility for the direction and consequences of our foreign policy.

We reaffirm our conviction that the United States must cooperate with all nations and dependent areas in their struggle for freedom and justice. Our national self-interest must be defined in terms broad enough to include the rights and needs of other peoples. We urge the United States to continue and to increase its support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, recognizing that any genuine international cooperation carries with it some limitation on national freedom of action.

The great power and vast resources of the United States are not our own to do with as we please. They are the gifts of God, and we are accountable to God and to our fellowmen for their use. Let us accept this great responsibility with humility and courage, remembering the words of our Lord: "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required."

—Excerpts from the 1952 World Order Message of the National Council of Churches.

leaders, is more likely to give us a foreign policy that accepts the essential unity of our world and the moral responsibility of the United States to use its abilities and resources to help those in need?"

It is impossibly idealistic to expect national governments to put the welfare of all the world's people on an equal plane with that of its own people. The first aim

of American foreign policy is and will continue to be the safeguarding of the national existence and the preservation of our freedom and prosperity. Yet there is in this matter an easily detectable difference between statesmen. The words of some suggest that if they thought the U. S. could buy its own peace and well-being at the price of the suffering or even the destruction of other nations, they would be in favor of such a course. They assent grudgingly, if at all, to international consultation, to Point IV programs, to reciprocal trade agreements and to multilateral action in the United Nations. Their tributes to American power and wealth are not rooted in humble gratitude and are unaccompanied by a recognition that we are stewards, not final owners. If they are not usually as crude as the Mid-Western Congressman who talks about a "bunch of foreigners," their more sophisticated speech does not disguise their essential rebellion against our involvement in the problems and needs of other nations. A Christian ought not to vote for any candidate for national office who does not support the Point IV program, not because Point IV is by itself an adequate vehicle for our response to world needs, but because its philosophy and general approach mean that we do accept responsibility for helping those who are in great need and take seriously the problem of finding an effective way to help.

Tariffs vs. Free Trade

Another test of the political leader's rejection of a narrowly nationalistic standard is his attitude toward trade restrictions. In an article in the *New York Times* (April 27, 1952) Michael L. Hoffman, writing from Geneva, sums up this problem. He says:

"Britain has added her voice to those of continental countries to remind the United States politely but firmly that American import restrictions and threats of new import restrictions violate United States commitments, under international agreements, negate United States statements of its own international economic interests and

threaten to nullify completely the progress Europe has made during the past few years toward a reasonable degree of economic balance with the world."

Mr. Hoffman goes on to say:

"After five years of promises by the Administration, Congress has still not passed any customs simplification law. The United States has not joined the ITO. Unilaterally and in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the United States slapped quotas on imports of cheese, milk products and casein, thus at one blow crippling the major dollar-earning industries in Italy, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway and New Zealand."

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, first passed in 1934, designed to increase world trade, is being whittled away by qualifying clauses inserted by Congress, including the "escape clause" and the "peril point" amendment. The Defense Production Act added further amendments. This is an old problem, which becomes increasingly acute in the post-war period. The problem is: are we going to put up "protective" tariff walls whenever it appears that United States producers need them in order to overcome the difference between American and European production costs? If so, we enhance the prosperity of certain American industries at the expense of the American public and at the price of depressing living standards in other parts of the world. Americans must decide which is more important—European economic stability or the protection of the U. S. blue cheese industry. No doubt this problem does not admit of easy solution, but one thing seems clear: the solution will not be found by politicians who think primarily in the old nationalistic terms. Sole emphasis on American prosperity is both bad economics and bad morality. It might be added that, according to Mr. Hoffman, Europeans understand that our shortsighted tariff measures "are largely the result of Congressional sniping at an Administration policy and not reneging on the part of the Administration itself."

Implicit, if not explicit, in what has been said in this article is a considerable skepticism about the capacity of the Republican Party under whatever Presidential leadership, to work effectively toward the main goals of a responsible foreign policy. Yet there are considerations which might incline one who strongly believes in these goals to favor giving the Republicans a chance.

If we elect another Democratic administration might not the already bitter resentments and deep frustrations of the Republicans be intensified to the point of producing a political climate which would seriously weaken the United States at home and abroad? This is not to suggest that a six-times defeated minority might resort to unconstitutional—that is, fascistic—attempts to thwart the will of the majority. It is only to raise the question whether the advantages of keeping in power an administration with a comparatively sound foreign policy might not be offset by the consequently sharpened intransigence of a large minority. Aside from an intensified opposition in Congress, extreme right-wing groups, having been unable in government to achieve any redress at all of their grievances, would almost certainly step up their effort to silence liberal voices in non-governmental areas. Balked in their bid for control of public policy, they would certainly step up the tendency toward thought control. It is at least possible, on the other hand, that with the Republicans once more in power after their long exile, the average liberal citizen might suffer somewhat less from the unreasoning hostility now directed against him by those who feel so deeply frustrated politically.

If the Republicans Win

One must remember, also, that the vote of legislators is determined partly by conviction and partly by the desire to strike at the Administration or, in the case of Democrats, by the desire to remain in the good graces of the Administration. The recent voting record of a Republican Congressman or Senator is not an infallible indication of how he would vote if the

Continued on page 30

Freedom, Power and the State

William Muehl

Recently a prominent labor leader in explaining why he preferred the Wagner Act to the Taft-Hartley Act divided his argument into two parts. In the first half he pointed out that the Wagner Act, which he liked, had put the power of the federal government squarely behind the principle and practice of collective bargaining. In the second half of his talk he complained bitterly because the Taft-Hartley Act had brought the government into labor disputes to an unprecedented degree. This kind of argument is not limited to labor leaders. It has its counterpart in the business man who insists that the state has no right to regulate corporations, forgetting or ignoring the fact that a corporation is an artificial unit created by the state in opposition to the basic principles of free enterprise capitalism. This kind of talk has led cynics to note that *good* laws are those which bind other people! And *bad* laws are those which bind us! There is a common human tendency to regard the state as a nuisance except when it can be used to advance our own selfish interests.

How much power should the state have to plan and regulate the daily activities of its citizens? This question has vexed philosophers and laymen in almost every age. There are scores of theories of the state which answer the question in many different ways. But let's look for a few minutes now at the bases for a Christian answer to the question of the state and the power it wields.

There are some who speak of the conflict between the state and the individual as if the state were by definition a calculating tyrant bent on collectivizing all organic life and the individual a splendidly isolated character who if left alone by the government will naturally come to the full flower of perfect manhood. A Christian must say, first of all, that this is not very realistic. There is no such thing as an unqualified

individual. The Christian believes that God created us as persons to live together. We were created in community and we are saved in community. We are not really persons at all except in the community of persons. The individual apart from society is quickly reduced to barbarism.

The Fact of Interdependence

The Christian understands further that one cannot think about the relation of the individual to the state except in terms of one's basic idea of the individual. Our definition of man says something about our view of government and power. Since we live and work together in society we are inevitably related to one another, our actions affect one another in many important ways. If I buy from you, you get my money. You are richer because of my action. If you talk to me, you influence my thinking and I am a different person in many subtle ways because of our conversation. My choice of a candidate for president, the way I vote, helps to put in power a man and program which will have profound influences on your life. We live together, not in occasional brief contact, but with continuous effect on one another.

One of the commonest and most dangerous forms of sin is man's attempt to deny this fact of interdependence. One of the earliest and most dramatic manifestations of sin in the Bible is seen in Cain's question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" And one of the last bits of advice from Apostle Paul in the New Testament concerns the need for our understanding that we are all members of one body: if any member of that body rebels against that unity, the whole body is injured. The Christian faith does not preach or approve of the regimentation of individuals. It teaches rather that men do, in fact live in community, and that only here is there hope of becoming the children of God.

Men seldom deny completely their involvement with one another. We resist the notion more frequently by denying the *implications* of human community. We say, "Of course I am my brother's keeper." Therefore, I shall do what I think is best for him. In this way my love for my children, my employees, or a racial minority takes the form of benevolent domination. When we try this tempting paternalistic solution to the problem of interdependence we are guilty of distorting the real meaning of community.

The Problem of Power

Living in community poses not only the problem of interdependence but also the problem of power. What is the nature of the government's power, and how can the power which the state has serve the people? For the Christian the state is not an unnatural creation of evil men. It is a natural and inevitable result of the complexity of society. *The state does not create power. It is one of various forces in the community competing for the possession and exercise of power.* Power itself is generated by the growth and conflict inevitable in any dynamic social order. When men live in isolation and work apart each in his separate concern, there is little need for authority. When men live close together and work in close cooperation on common projects they will unavoidably differ on what should be done and how to do it. These differences create the necessity for some final decision on policy and practice. The necessity for such decisions creates power in someone. Thus, the need for planning and decision-making creates power vacuums into which some kind of authority is always drawn. The state may step into these situations and assume the power created by the conflict of interests. But the state is rarely the creator of the situation in the first place.

This can be seen in the history of federal regulation of American business. The federal government did nothing of importance to regulate business enterprise *until*

Radio Scripts on Christian Freedom Are Now Available

A series of four 15-minute radio scripts on the Christian concept of freedom has been prepared by the Religion at the News Desk Committee in New Haven, Conn. Written in a popular style suitable for broadcasting over local stations, the series deals with the nature of freedom and its relation to government, to economics and to foreign policy. The article on these pages, "Freedom, Power and the State," by William Muehl, is a condensation of one of these scripts. Readers of *Christianity and Society* can get the four scripts by sending 25¢ to Religion at the News Desk, 409 Prospect St., New Haven 11, Conn.

business enterprise had begun to regulate itself. Near the turn of the century large corporations had found themselves forced to undertake some kind of integration of their own sprawling activities. They were stimulated in part by the desire to control the market and maintain satisfactory price levels, but they were also moved by the problems that beset any disintegrated large scale organization. As business began to undertake its own integration it was inevitable that the temptation would arise to organize against the general welfare rather than on behalf of it. Thus, monopolies and trusts appeared in which the aim of integration was domination of markets and price levels to the enrichment of the trust operators. At this point those who were the victims of these operations began to demand that something be done to prevent exploitation and impoverishment. The natural agency to which to look for relief was the federal government. As a result laws prohibiting or regulating certain forms of business combinations were enacted. The regulatory power of the state was in effect a substitute for the regulatory actions of the companies themselves. The

need for regulation had been created by the complexity and internal conflicts of the business community itself. The only choice was between regulation by the companies involved in behalf of their own profits and regulations by the government on behalf of the whole community.

Making Power Responsible

State regulation *can* be made responsible to the people. The exclusive obligation of government is to the popular welfare. There are means set up by which citizens *can* compel their officials to listen to their claims. Business is organized for profit. Self-discipline with reference to profits is alien to its fundamental purpose and its efforts on this score are always open to grave suspicion. Moreover there is no way in which the general public can examine and check on such self-disciplining devices *except* through government.

Big business and big government are facts of our present-day life. No man in his right mind assumes that we can return to the days of dis-integration. Even the men who cry the loudest for a reduction of government activities do not usually propose to reduce the complexity of business and society in general. To reduce *government* power will not destroy power. It will simply put it into other hands. And there is no room in Christian thought for the notion that it will automatically fall into the most appropriate and responsible hands.

The real problem of today, then, is how to control power. To act as if it can be ignored or cursed out of existence only

enhances the possibility that it *will* be abused and will constitute a threat to freedom. The foundation of responsible government is a citizenry which understands the importance of politics. Control of the organs of government can be made effective only when the voting public has a clear understanding of the nature of political parties, the need for a consistent and enforceable party program, the significance of party labels and the preeminence of *issues* over candidates' personalities. One of the best evidences of the insincerity of much denunciation of "statism" is the eagerness of those who use that term to maintain old patterns of whimsical and irresponsible voting habits. The very men who shout the loudest about "statism" are the ones who most consistently oppose any attempt to build a party system which would give the voter *real* control of his elected officials and their actions in office. One is not cynical if he infers from this that often those who claim that the government has too much power really mean that *they have too little power.*

Through his faith, the Christian can understand the dangers of power. But he knows that they are the dangers of *power* itself, not merely the dangers of *state* power. Man is created and destined to live in community. From experience, man knows that his social relations become tangled and complex. This complexity creates centers of power, which cannot be ignored, but must be controlled. The Christian faith does not tell us how to vote, but it gives us the basis for responsible decisions.

Among Those Present

● *John C. Bennett* is Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics at Union Theological Seminary, New York. ● *David S. Burgess* is Executive Secretary, Georgia State Industrial Union Council, CIO. ● *William Clemes* is Associate Director of Public Relations, National Council of Churches. ● *John Dillenberger* is on the faculty of Religion at Columbia University. ● *Robert T. Handy* is Assistant Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary. ● *John Hutchinson* is from Williams College in Massachusetts. ● *Ernest Lefever* is Associate Executive Director of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill, National Council of Churches. ● *William Muehl* teaches Public Speaking at Yale Divinity School. ● *Herman F. Reissig* is International Relations Secretary of the Congregational Council for Social Action.

Here and There

What Is the National Interest?

The question of serving the national interest is always a subtle and complex one in real situations.

I am sure all of the following things are clearly in our national interest: To avoid war; to preserve our institutions; to have strong allies; to avoid inflation; to have a prosperous civilian economy; to find common grounds on which to stand with the various nations which have newly come to responsibility; to preserve our access to strategic waterways and vital raw materials; and to protect the property and safety of our nationals abroad.

I could extend this list by dozens of items.

Now any matter of foreign policy pertaining only to the realization of one of those items would not present an issue at all. No one would have to work his brains overtime on it. No series of exhaustive meetings would have to be held. No protracted debate about the nuances and contradictions would be necessary. In such an instance the policy decision would crystallize spontaneously.

In any practical question presenting a real issue the national interest has several aspects. Indeed, there are many national interests, not just one.

The difficulties arise in the conflict of one interest with another; for example, in the clash of the interest in peace with the interest in preserving national institutions, in the clash of the interest of having a strong defense with the interest in having a strong civilian economy, or in the clash of the interest in preserving access to a waterway with the interest in eliciting the adherence of another country to one's cause.

From an address by Charles B. Marshall before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., April 18, 1952. Mr. Marshall is a member of the State Department Policy Planning Staff.

Council for Social Action Upheld

The Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches was given a 689-to-31 vote of confidence at the biennial General Council meeting held in Claremont, California, in June. There were 19 abstentions. Critics of the CSA charged it with "trying to put the church into power politics." The vote was on a report of the CSA's stewardship which said that Christian social action is "a contemporary expression" of the "conviction that the God of Jesus Christ seeks to transform society and calls upon us to serve Himself and our neighbor by promoting justice, freedom and order." Dean Liston Pope, co-chairman of Christian Action, is chairman of the Council for Social Action.

Tape Recorder to Speak Back

The Peoria, Illinois, Council of Churches held a unique public hearing in connection with the race for the office of state attorney.

The Council's public affairs committee invited all five candidates to present their views on certain "moral issues," such as gambling, vice and prostitution and the handling of juvenile delinquents.

Each candidate was given an opportunity to make a five-minute presentation on these topics. The 150 persons attending the event questioned the candidates at length following their presentations.

Committee chairman Boyd F. Goldsworthy stressed that one of the meeting's greatest values was a tape recording of the proceedings. These will be used to confront the successful candidate after the November election if he does not meet his campaign promises.

Americans for Democratic Action

Many members of Christian Action are active in Americans for Democratic Action, an independent political organization which is expected to play a significant role in the November election. Some of our members have asked for more information about this organization which Reinhold Niebuhr helped to found five years ago and of which he is at present a national vice-chairman. In this special campaign issue we have decided to let ADA speak for itself. In addition to reprinting ADA's statement of purpose, we will lift some quotations on fiscal issues from its 1952 policy pronouncement. Further information can be had by writing ADA, 1341 Connecticut Ave., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

ADA's Statement of Purpose

Americans for Democratic Action is an organization of progressive, dedicated to the achievement of freedom and economic security for all people everywhere, through education and democratic political action.

We believe that rising living standards and lasting peace can be attained by democratic planning, enlargement of fundamental liberties and international cooperation.

We believe that all forms of totalitarianism, including Communism, are incompatible with these objectives. In our crusade for an expanding democracy and against fascism and reaction, we welcome as members of ADA only those whose devotion to the principles of political freedom is unqualified.

Taxation and Fiscal Policy

1. Short of total war, it is desirable during the mobilization period to pursue a pay-as-we-go policy. The current prospect is that increased revenue needs can be met without increasing existing tax rates, but by closing loopholes and eliminating inequities in the tax structure as well as by strengthening collection procedures.

2. Individual income tax rates are currently as high as they were at the peak of World War II but many taxpayers are paying considerably less taxes. The adoption by Congress of provisions for split incomes and family partnerships have en-

abled upper-bracket taxpayers to escape their just share of taxes. Continuation and in some cases extension of such inequities and loopholes as capital gains, depletion allowances, tax exempt state and local securities, unreported corporate interest and dividends, have further enabled well-to-do taxpayers to escape their fair and equitable share of taxes. The continuation of many glaring loopholes in our estate and gift tax structure keeps much needed revenue from finding its way into the Federal Treasury. These loopholes and inequities in our tax laws must be eliminated.

3. Excise taxes should not be extended. As and when the need for revenue eases, excise taxes should be progressively removed.

4. We are unequivocally opposed to a general sales tax, whether it be collected at the retail or manufacturing level.

5. Many states are sparking a drive to place a tax limit of 25 percent on taxing power of the federal government on individuals, corporations or estates. These efforts to shift the lion's share of the tax burden to low and middle income families and to small business generally are incredibly greedy and irresponsible. If successful, they would cut government tax revenues by tens of billions, compel a vast inflationary borrowing and reduce millions of our citizens to an impossible poverty.

Foreign Economic Policy

The basic goals of the free world cannot be achieved without building economic as

well as military strength. One of the dangers today is that human misery will go unattended in favor of rearmament. Building economic strength is a job not for the United States alone but for every free nation. Only then will the economic and technical assistance programs of the U. S. succeed. Such programs must benefit the masses, not privileged groups. They must treat nations as equals joined in a common effort.

We support these specific actions:

1. Utilize UN agencies as fully as possible.
2. Increase economic aid under the Mutual Security Act and invigorate the Point Four program.
3. Help break up cartels; strengthen the free trade union movement.
4. Provide incentives and remove obstacles to the investment of private capital in undeveloped areas.
5. Delete from the Mutual Security Act objectionable conditions required from nations receiving assistance.
6. Reduce tariffs, avoid trade restrictions, and allocate raw materials equitably; extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program.
7. Reserve to the Executive the power to deal with East-West trade so as best to serve democratic interests.
8. Support the UN General Assembly proposal for an international development fund to aid underdeveloped nations in financing projects which cannot pay for themselves.

Social Security

1. We urge legislation to expand the coverage and to increase the benefits under the Social Security Act.
2. We favor federal administration of the unemployment insurance program. Pending this we call for the repeal of the Knowland Amendment which limits federal power to require high state standards and which constitutes a threat to organized labor.
3. We urge the immediate repeal of the Jenner Amendment which permits the

states to publicize the names of those receiving welfare assistance.

4. We urge the Congress to enact a cash benefit, contributory, sickness and disability insurance system. We also feel that it is the responsibility of Congress to provide hospitalization for the aged.

5. We oppose general veterans pension bills.

6. We believe that private pension and welfare systems cannot serve as a substitute for an adequate, inclusive, integrated public program, but can only supplement such a program.

7. We favor the immediate establishment of a Department of Welfare in the Cabinet.

The Nation's Health

1. The ADA has consistently supported enactment of a comprehensive national health insurance program based on the plan presented by President Truman. Although various aspects of the proposed program have produced controversy, we believe that the essential outline of this program is sound. We believe that the program has been completely misrepresented, that the American people accept its essential principles. We deplore the tactics employed by the leadership of the American Medical Association to defeat any and all proposals to improve the nation's health, and we call upon all Americans to repudiate these efforts.

2. To clear the doubts raised by these attacks, President Truman has appointed a Commission on the Nation's Health Needs with a mandate to make unbiased, factual recommendations within a year. The Commission's report should provide the people and their representatives with a comprehensive, factual basis for enacting a socially desirable and operationally sound program.

3. But we must not forget the urgent need to assure adequate medical care for all our people. Studies, though needed, cannot be accepted as excuses for postponement of necessary action. We therefore urge immediate action in all fields where adequate information is already available.

Some Political Pamphlets

Local Christian Action groups will find the following pamphlets helpful as they discuss the issues of and participate in the election campaign. The two numbers of Social Action listed here have been distributed to Christian Action members.

The Christian Faith and American Politics, in *Social Action*, November, 1951. Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y. 35 pages. 25¢. A presentation of Christian responsibility in politics and an evaluation of Protestant political behavior in the U. S.

Politics is What You Make It by Joseph E. McLean, 1952. Public Affairs Committee, 22 E. 38th St., New York 16, N. Y. 32 pages. 25¢. A handbook on how to be effective in influencing domestic and foreign policy decisions in the U. S.

Religious Ethics and the Politics of Power by Vernon H. Holloway, 1951. Church Peace Union, 170 E. 64th St., New York 21, N. Y. 72 pages. 50¢. A brilliant study booklet dealing with the problem of political power in light of the Christian faith.

The Christian Faith and World Upheaval, in *Social Action*, March, 1952. Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y. 48 pages. 25¢. A Christian interpretation of U. S. responsibility in foreign affairs. Opens with a freshly-worded section on "guiding religious convictions."

The Story of U. S. Foreign Policy by Dexter Perkins, 1951. Foreign Policy Association, 22 E. 38th St., New York 16, N. Y. 50 pages. 35¢. Well written historical summary of U. S. policy including a presentation of current problems.

Our Foreign Policy-1952. Department of State Publication 4466. Order from

Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C. 80 pages. 25¢. An official statement of overall U. S. policy including topics such as Korea, the North Atlantic area, Germany, the Truman Doctrine, the Mutual Security Program Point IV, the UN, disarmament, human rights, and the Voice of America.

The Only War We Seek by Arthur Goodfriend, 1951. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Ave., N. W., Washington 6, D. C. 127 pages. \$1.00. A striking photographic portrayal of the problem of interpreting U. S. policy in underdeveloped areas, especially in Asia.

Point Four and the World Economy by J. B. Condliffe, 1950. Foreign Policy Association, 22 E. 38th St., New York 16, N. Y. 62 pages. 35¢. An excellent introduction to economic development abroad in the context of the total world economy. Deals with international trade.

International Covenant on Human Rights by O. Frederick Nolde, 1952. American Association for the U. N., 45 E. 65th St., New York 21, N. Y. 15 pages. Single copies free. Deals with the present status of the Covenant and answers criticisms directed against it.

The United Nations General Assembly in Paris by Owen E. Pence, in *Information Service*, May 10, 1952, National Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y. 10¢.

This essay gives not only a graphic report of the U. N. Assembly, but deals with problem of our responsibility in face of resurgent nationalism and moral isolationism.

How Did Your Senators and Congressman Vote in 1951 and 1952, published by eight Protestant social education groups. (See editorial on page 7 for further details.)

REVIEWS

Some Protestant Counter-Heresies

"Christian Faith and the Protestant Churches," *Social Action*, XVIII (May, 1952). Published by the Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y. 25 cents.

The pamphlet "Christian Faith and the Protestant Churches" is the sixth and last of the "Series on Christian Community" that have appeared as recent issues of *Social Action*. The pamphlets will be revised and reprinted as one book. Readers of *Christianity and Society* will find the entire series of interest, and especially this last incisive issue. This series is being distributed to members of Christian Action.

It is asserted that the recent vigorous Protestant protest against the "heresies" of Catholicism have shown that Protestantism has itself fallen victim to certain "counter-heresies." First, in reaction to the Catholic position on the relation of church and state, Protestantism has abandoned its historic sense of a Christian vocation for participation in the world. In early Protestantism the separation of church and state was the Puritan's creative way of relating faith to culture; church and state were not two insulated compartments, but rather interrelated parts of a whole society. "But within the last forty years, at a time when Roman Catholicism poses an increasing threat to Protestant influence over American culture, a large group of Protestants has abandoned the Puritan tradition, and assumed that the slogan meant *absolute* separation between church and state" (4).

This has had far-reaching consequences, especially in public education, for "if we choose to ignore the public school system as an avenue of religious instruction so as to 'keep the Catholics out,' then in effect we allow secular theologies to become the source of meaning and motivation for the public school system" (5). The second Protestant counter-heresy, the denial of cor-

porate discipline and authority, also involves the abandonment of the Puritan tradition, and means that for most Protestants religion has become a private affair between the individual and God alone. The search for the truth of the Gospel within community has all but disappeared. "The corporate assemblies of the church have become sessions for trivia rather than for religious contention with the hard issues of public concern" (9).

Protestantism today is in need of and in search for a concept of the church that will help it to preach the gospel effectively to the whole world. The authors undertake a three-fold analysis of the church. "The church is first, and most obviously, a creature of present culture; secondly, perhaps less obviously, a creature of tradition; and finally, the enduring re-created creature of the Gospel" (11). As creature of culture, the church rather transparently takes on the attitudes and techniques of the world about it. For example, the methods of contemporary advertising, with the treatment of the audience as a "mass," pervades the church's understanding of how it should seek to influence society. The social separations and cleavages of contemporary culture are also mirrored in American Protestantism, for class and race lines are not conspicuously transcended. As creature of tradition, the American church is overwhelmed by its recent past, for "Protestant tradition is for the modern church that of a private religion and of purely individual influence—aspects of Protestantism which emerged most strongly in the past century and a half" (19). Hence however much Protestantism seeks to apprehend the judgments the Gospel makes on our society there is no solid institutional basis from which such judgments can be effectively made, there is no organizational basis for effective work for justice in specific social situations. And attempts to make common witness concerning moral issues involved in politics, economics or mass communica-

ons seem to many to run counter to the addition of "historic" Protestantism.

The church is more than a creature of culture and tradition—it is a captive of the Gospel. In responding to our discernment of God's activity in the modern world, Protestantism needs to rethink its polity arrangements. This involves a reconsideration of the grounds of authority: today authority roots too much in the minister's personal charisma rather than in the context of corporate study and action, with unsatisfactory results.

The pamphlet closes with a discussion of the church as both critic and sustainer of society. "The church is even more 'conservative' than the conservatives, for it seeks to preserve not only the presently existing values but also alongside them the values displaced. It is even more 'radical' than the radicals for it criticizes and wants to upplant every partiality both of the existing order and of the emerging order of the radicals. In other words, the church is not above strife, but in it in a more profound way at a more profound level" (39 f.).

This is an aggressive, hard-hitting, stimulating booklet that will not fail to create vigorous discussion wherever it is seriously read. A great deal of ground is covered in brief compass. The theological statements in particular are so concisely put without elaboration or documentation that they will undoubtedly lead to some misunderstanding. But many very illuminating and valuable suggestions are made. This is an analysis worth careful attention.

It is unfortunate that the word "Puritan" is so loosely used throughout, with never an attempt at explanation of what is meant. Because of popular misconceptions it is risky to use the term without at least minimal clarification. The assumption that American Protestantism was once Puritan Protestantism needs correction and qualification; it would be fairer to indicate that historic Protestantism in America was largely shaped by certain strains of Puritanism in combination with other Protestant traditions.

The implications of the remarks concerning the nature of the church are somewhat perplexing. "Ultimately Protestants must face faithfully what kind of institutional reformulation will most adequately serve God's will in modern society. We who write this series believe that had more churches become communities of believers convinced of the urgency of transforming our culture and its centers of policy making, the problem of polity would have long ago been seen in its true importance" (27). There is more than a suggestion of a new "instrumentalist" view of the church here; the transition between "serving God's will" and "transforming our culture" is too easily made. The profound Protestant perspectives as to the nature of the church emerging from the ecumenical movement and the theological revival, of which these authors speak highly, can serve as a corrective at this point.

Robert T. Handy
Union Theological Seminary

Loyalty in a Democratic State

Conflict of Loyalties, A Series of Addresses and Discussions, edited by R. M. MacIver. Published by The Institute for Religious and Social Studies. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 150 pages. \$2.00.

The eleven essays in this volume were originally given as lectures at The Institute for Religious and Social Studies of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America in the winter of 1950-51. It is one of the number of volumes on religion and civilization sponsored by the Institute.

Not having read those which have already appeared, I have no basis for comparing this venture with the others. Taken by itself, the book presents the problem of the best of symposiums—that the vigorous and sustained pursuit of problems that one has been accustomed to expect from individuals in their own mature writing is conspicuously lacking. Perhaps this is particularly inevitable when the spoken word of the lecture platform too readily is transferred onto the printed page. These essays are actually of a fairly even quality, so that

the defect of the book is one of conception and execution rather than that of the ideas of the writers themselves. The only excuse for the existence of this volume is that it does provide us with a record—emaciated though it is—of meetings which have been both timely and vital.

Central to all the essays is the conflict in which men frequently find themselves between the obligations which society, primarily through the State, imposes upon them and those values and obligations of conscience and nature which express a confession of loyalty higher than the law of the land. But this problem is never dealt with on a broad scope. Facets of it are explored by the respective writers in terms of their own convictions and experience. Consequently the central problem, stated somewhat as above by MacIver, is never hit "head on".

Closest to the central problem, though not necessarily the most profound, is the essay by Lyman Bryson. He makes much of the notion that the essence of democracy consists in the possibility of human growth and that this includes making mistakes. Bryson thinks that the basis and nature of political action should never be defined in terms of successful political results. Such a definition is the essence of an authoritarian rather than a democratic structure. Nowhere does he give a basis for his faith in the democratic process. It is an assumption, religious in nature, perhaps best expressed in the essay by Mr. Saudek of the

American Broadcasting Company, who states that because of the diversity of motivation permitted within democracy, one obviously needs to count on the triumph of our own better natures. This faith, common to many of the writers, does not deal adequately with the problem of the possibility of a democracy destroying itself through too naive a faith in itself.

Dr. Finkelstein indirectly touches this problem in his analysis of the relation of the individual to institutions. Institutions, he asserts, are meant to serve God and thus man, but also tend to deny this when they become ends in themselves. It would therefore appear that the most adequate basis for any institution is a transcendent loyalty even as the institution is being formed. The danger in institutional forms which are taken too seriously apart from the transcendent claims of laws of self—whether autonomous in the best sense or theonomous—is depicted in the essay by Rogen N. Baldwin, long associated with the American Civil Liberties Union, and Franz Neumann, noted political scientist and a member of the Department of Government at Columbia University. The former draws on concrete experiences of the American Civil Liberties Union, and the latter elaborates his point through an analysis of various political philosophies.

The essay most immediately relevant to current problems is that by Professor Lasswell, who concentrates on the threat to "privacy" brought on by the fact "that from a scientific and technical point of view . . . the secrets of living people can be obtained at will" (p. 126) and that this is an increasing danger as governments act under the demands of national security. The urgency of this problem, illustrated and analyzed so well by Professor Lasswell, makes this, I think, by far the most important essay in the symposium.

Other essays are by F. Ernest Johnson, who writes interestingly on the relation of truth to fact and fiction; Hans Simons, who while disavowing a theoretical solution of the ends-means problem, nevertheless provides some suggestive ways of relating the

GOWNS
PULPIT·CHOIR
CONFIRMATION
BAPTISMAL
DOCTORS
MASTERS
BACHELORS
CAPS GOWNS
AND
HOODS
EST. 1912
BENTLEY & SIMON
7 WEST 36 ST. NEW YORK 18, N.Y.



two; Liston Pope, who, in the midst of an analysis of the American business community, provides a suggestive interpretation of "the mammon of unrighteousness"; Ordway Tead, who focuses the problem of pressures in education; and W. W. Waymack who gives a fairly balanced article on the issue of Hiroshima.

John Dillenger
Columbia University

Russell vs. Russell

New Hopes For A Changing World, by Bertrand Russell. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1952. 213 pages. \$3.00.

Bertrand Russell is a paradoxical figure in contemporary thought. He appears to believe in progress with a kind of naive intensity of conviction, yet no one could give a more grim picture of man's prospects for survival in an atomic age than he presents. Russell believes that man must make his own way in an alien world, yet he has an almost religious belief in the dependent, limited character of man's life. He is deeply concerned with present human ills, yet his basic attitude is one of utopian optimism—one is tempted to say deferred optimism. He believes that man is a rational animal, yet his conception of man is haunted by a sense of the heights and depths of human nature which elude simple rationalism. All these and many more paradoxes are present in clear and plain fashion in his latest book, *New Hopes for a Changing World*. The result is that the book, like so many others which Russell has written, is a curious mixture of keen and at times profound observation, and gratuitous nonsense.

The title of the book correctly suggests the note of optimism which pervades it. The last two chapters are entitled "The Happy Man" and "The Happy World." They bear very little relation, so far as I can see, to Russell's analysis of such present and urgent problems as war and increasing population surpluses which, as Russell points out, press so hard upon food supplies.

Russell's optimism is tempered by what

looks like an increasing note of stoic fortitude. In a time of troubles like the present, we are told that the contemplation of timeless truths and values can be of great use to man's spirit. This suggestion of Russell illustrates the fact that for many non-Christians Stoicism becomes the only viable creed for the present situation.

In the present volume Russell maintains the consistent anti-religion which has characterized his previous works. One has the feeling that in this facet of his thought he is still trying to shock his maiden aunt. It is an attitude which at times leads him to say things which are plainly not so. For example, the notion of sin is a favorite target. It is "negative and arid" and it implies that "our natural impulses are bad." We are told specifically: "Sin is only part of my nature, but it is the whole of my enemies." (page 14) Russell's anti-religion also prevents him from seeing the very close relation between his notion of cooperation and the Christian virtue of love or brotherhood. His fear of being found with a trace of traditionalism leads him to term the notion of "western values" rubbish. The European tradition has been characterized by nothing so much as the emergence of science and scientific technique, rather than any common moral ideals.

The best thing in this book is Russell's analysis of present world population problems and prospects. By contrast, his analysis of the prospects for world government lacks appreciation of the sub-rational factors which are so decisive in political affairs. In general, Russell's analysis of specific social problems is more cogent and illuminating than his appraisal of the human situation in general or perennial terms.

It is a good thing for Christians to read occasionally a book like this. One is enabled to compare faiths, as it were,—Christianity with Russell's humanism. And despite his lapse into stark nonsense, one can learn from Russell.

John Hutchison
Williams College

issues of public policy and the false issues of political propaganda. This is a year-around task for the churches, rather than a last minute and often vain call for cool heads on the eve of a hot political contest. Each area of America has its own particular brand of political lies and deceits which like a smoke screen blind the eyes of voters at election time. In the South, men in public office appeal to race prejudice with considerable success. Senator Willis Smith of North Carolina did it in 1950 and was able to defeat "the most Christian man in the U. S. Senate"—Frank Graham. It has been the stock-and-trade of Governor Talmadge, Senator Smathers, Governor Shivers, Senator Byrd and Governor Byrnes. In the face of these preachments of hate and division, the churches of the South have remained silent. Occasionally, a minister decries the use of racial lies. In the main, however, his warnings come too late and are too frequently couched in the language of mere moralisms. His actions are almost futile because the churches of the South have not yet made up their minds about segregation—the system which is the root source racial lies at election time. Similarly, the churches of other regions can do little or nothing to counteract the political lies and half-truths of political campaigns until they are able to cope more successfully with the causes of these falsehoods—class-hatred, class-pride, fears and inequalities in American life.

Above all, it is the duty of the churches to point out the political naivete and the false theological assumptions among their members. Protestants of today tend to believe in the easy harmony of competing economic interests, in the seductions of political propagandists, in a simple solution to the problem of political corruption, in the inadvisability of statutes with penalty provisions, in the constant threat of emerging minority groups. These false beliefs are distortions of and perversions original Gospel truths.

same, or similar, measures were sponsored by an administration representing his own party. Those who scoff at the traditional Republican predictions that grass would grow in the streets or our system of free elections would come to an end if the Democrats won should not be too quick to prophesy a wholesale retreat into nationalism and unilateralism if the Republicans are voted into office.

Thinking only of foreign policy, one can hardly contemplate with serenity the idea of Mr. Taft either in the White House or as leader of a Congressional majority. Yet the Senator's all-out attack on the present foreign policy would seem to be motivated in part by the conviction that such attack is the way to win the election. His real convictions on international questions and, more important, his actual policies as President, might well be more sober and intelligent than his partisan speeches suggest. The responsibilities of the highest office could not do much for a Warren G. Harding, but Mr. Taft is not Mr. Harding. Indeed, "Mr. Republican," in a possibly unguarded moment, declared that "there is much more agreement on the general character of the strategy to be adopted than is generally supposed."

As he prepares for the November elections the voter should, therefore, consider many factors—the attitude of the aspirant to the Presidency toward the three main goals of foreign policy; the possibility that Congress may whittle away or thwart a satisfactory administration policy, as it has done largely in the case of world trade; whether a wise foreign policy would be negated by overly conservative domestic policies, such as the insistence on reducing taxes and balancing the budget; the total political situation in this country, particularly the frustration of Republicans, caused by their repeated defeats; the erosion of moral tone and drive in Democratic ranks, the result of an insufficiently vigorous party leadership and of long years in power.



*Reinhold
Niebuhr's*

new book

THE IRONY OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*By the author of
THE NATURE AND
DESTINY OF MAN*

Any book by Reinhold Niebuhr is an important event. His new book comes at a time when Americans must face cold facts rather than the cozy illusions nurtured by our past. Dr. Niebuhr contrasts devastatingly our present role as a world power and our self-portrait of innocence. Above all he gives us a forceful restatement of man's place in God's universe.

\$2.50

At your bookseller

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

William Warren Sweet

RELIGION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN CULTURE

How the practical theology of the 18th and 19th Centuries influenced everyday life and got things done. **\$3.50**

William A. Spurrier

GUIDE TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

The role of belief in everyday life. It gives the mature knowledge necessary for an adequate philosophy of life in the complex world of today. **\$2.50**

Amos N. Wilder

MODERN POETRY AND THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Winner of the \$7,500 Special Decennial Award of the Bross Foundation. **\$3.00**

John Short

TRIUMPHANT BELIEVING

20 sermons — a sure antidote to apathy and anxiety — which strengthen the Christian faith. **\$2.50**

John Baillie

NATURAL SCIENCE AND THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

An intellectually satisfying resolution to a once-bitter quarrel. **\$1.75**

James A. Montgomery

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF KINGS

A new volume in the famous International Critical Commentary. **\$5.00**

Michael de la Bedoyere

THE LIFE OF BARON VON HUGEL

The first full-length biography of one of the world's great mystics. **\$5.00**

Hans Lietzmann

THE ERA OF THE CHURCH FATHERS

Vol. IV in a history of the early church, which has already begun to be accepted as the standard work on the subject. Vol. I — The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Vol. II — The Founding of the Church Universal. Vol. III — From Constantine to Julian.

Each volume, special net \$5.50

THE QUR'ĀN AS SCRIPTURE

By ARTHUR JEFFERY

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AND ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES,

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

112 pages, cloth binding, price \$3.25 per copy

The author provides a scholarly and readable account of the Qur'ān as the Scripture of Islam together with a discussion of the textual history of that remarkable book.

Recent advances in the comparative study of religion have concentrated interest on the problem of Scripture. There are religions which have no sacred writings and which seem to function very well without them. There are other religions which are in possession of religious writings which in a sense can be called sacred, but which have never been officially gathered into an authoritative "canonized" body of Scripture. In still other religions a canonical Scripture plays a very important role. Islam belongs to this latter class, for of the four "roots" of Islam the Qur'ān is the first and by far the most important. It is Muhammad's book. The impress of his personality is on it from the first word to the last. If read chronologically, it allows us to see something of the developing religion of Muhammad as he pushed on with his mission and the building up of his religious community.

In the first part of THE QUR'ĀN AS SCRIPTURE, Professor Jeffery explores the fundamental problem of how Muhammad came by his notion of Scripture and how he interpreted it in terms of his mission. In the latter part of the book he gives an account of how the present day lithographs of the Qur'ān derive from the earliest texts. Prior to the publication of the present volume, there has been very little in print, in English, that is readily available on this particular aspect of the Qur'ān.

Union Theological Seminary Book Service

3041 Broadway



New York 27, N. Y.